G. R. S. 58]

Previous references. Polit 9-20-1,2,3,5,9-15 & 23 (1922 - Imigrn)

File No. 399-22

Serial Nos. 1 - 4

Later references.

Pol 1 26-5866

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos.

Part B for April 1925

SUBJECT

Telegram from V. J. Krishniah Setty & others of Tirupur Complaining that the procession of Sri Ranganatha Swamy at the place has been objected to by the local authorities. Etc.

To the Mily. Comr.

B. C. 25

Do not agree with your views expressed

C. H.C.

G. R S. 11] 1922

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Imzad

NOTES.

File No.

FILE HEADING.

Procession of Sri Anjaneya
in Tiruvallur.

From

No.	Dated		Received
Diary No.	Enclos.	Spare Copies.	Serial No.

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

G. R S. III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc, not intended for permanent re

Telegram dated 6-4-1923 to Dewan Saheb, Bangalore.

Muzrai Anjaneyaswami temple usual Pamothsavam procession all streets objected by local authorities against Government orders. Regret stoppage procession. Pray orders local authorities allow usual Procession throughout to acquire gods blessings.

T.J.Krishniah Setty & others
Tiptur.

There are no papers on this subject in the Muz. Dept.

2) Draft letter to the Muz. Com. for very early enquiry and subm. of papers, within a fortnight with a view to appl. orders

BG 6/4/23

First Minister

8291-317 3) Action approved
10/4/23

N. B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips the notes must be cipoed, or slips pasted on this form.

G. R S. III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

No. 2674 D 12/4/25 to
the Asst. Comm.

Requests to enquire
the matter & to submit
a report to Govt.

Sl. 3 From: the Asst. Comm.
Letter no. C 738 D H-2-,

Submits report called
for in Sl. 2.

N. B—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

Serial No.

5) The Mudr Comm. letter explains the facts of the case fully.

6) The temple of Sri Angaraya Swamy in Tiptur is a Muz. endowed has been endowed with a small extent of inam land. It is reported that Utsavas in connection with the annual Ramotsava celebrations seem to have been conducted prior to the year 1923 without obtaining any license. On account of the strained relationship between the Hindus and Mahomedan residents of Tiptur, it has been ordered by the local authorities that a license should be taken from the Magistrate. The Muhammadan Magistrate has granted a license which directs the stoppage of music in front of the mosque.

(Vide Amildars report no. 869 Dy 11.5.23)

(Vide copy) P

7) The contention of the petn is that the restrictions newly laid down to take out licenses does not apply to processions with music of Muz. citizens and that G.O. no. P. 2303/ Police 9-20 Dy 16-9-1922 allowed the local masjid no greater privileges

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

Serial No.

that all places of worship were entitled to under the general law of the land.

The Inspr. Genl. points out that the need for the grant of a license is obvious that it is the duty of the aggrieved party to do so up in appeal in the formal manner and that if approved, a suitable endorsement will be given in conformity with the above.

9/3 Submitted for orders as to whether the M, Mag. Cir. may be asked to take 13/3/25. suitable orders in the case and leave the aggrieved party to appeal to Govt if they are dissatisfied with the order.

Bd
14-3-25

10) The Insp. Genl's proposal may be approved

16.3.25

Rev-Secy
13/3

463
20.3

1) I agree

Secy
16/3

16/3

463
20.3

G. R. S. III-2]

Muzrai Secretariat | Muz. File No. | of 192

Serial No. (12) Dr. 50 Inter...

G.O. is unnecessary. A letter
appears to the Journal will do
8.4.25

(13) Issue
8.4.25

To the Muzrai Commr. No. 1097/
18.4.25. Yours that Lr. [illegible]
him in the above expressed

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 0561—GPB—3750—1 8 22

Muz 4]

SUBJECT .....

Diary No. of letter replied to ___

Muzrai Secretariat

( )

, *the* 192 .

Date of issue 12.4.23

Signed by M. T. E. J. Nigam

Section

File No.

Serial No.

No. 2674
one telg

To The Mur. Com

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith telegram dd 6th Apl 23, received from A. J. Kamchatka Delhi & others complaining that the procession of Sri Ganga Jayanti at the Mosque during Ramzan has been objected to by the local authorities

over.

and request that
the matter may be
enquired into and
a report with the
papers submitted
to me. All of the Enclosed

Thanks

V. J. Mudge
Asst Sec 2

By
6/4/22

List of enclosures

Enid M Fields

Copied by

Examined by

WD 0563—GPB—2 500—27 7 22

34020

No. C 738 — Office of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.
m - 25
one one /

Dated Bangalore, 6th February 1925.

From

K. Chandy, Esquire., B.A.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

11 FEB 1925
MUZRAI
D. 1390

To
SECTION

K. V. Anantaraman, Esquire., B.A.,
Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Revenue Department.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No 2674 1494/M.F.39?-22-2 dated 12th April 1923 and subsequent communications regarding the procession of Sri Anjaneyaswami in Tiptur town, I have the honor to submit herewith copies of correspondence ending with letter H.C.No.854 of 22-23 dated 29th January 1925 from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, submitting a report in the matter.

The Amildar's report dated 11th May 1923 and the Deputy Commissioners letters under disposal give in succinct detail the facts of the case.

2. The temple of Sri Anjaneyaswami in Tiptur is a Muzrai Institution having been endowed with a small extent of inam land and -- utsavas in connection with the annual Ramotsava celebrations seem to have been conducted prior to the year 1923 without obtaining any license. On account of the strained relationship between the Hindu and Mahommedan residents of Tiptur, Mr. T.G. Krishna Setty - when he applied for Police help in connection with the celebrations of 1923 was directed by the Taluk Amildar to obtain a license from the -- Magistrate under Section 45 of Police Regulation. This order was appealed against and the Deputy Commissioner referred the petitioner to the Taluk Magistrate for a license-when an application inpursuance of the above was made, the Amildar-Magistrate granted a license which directed the stoppage of music in front of the mosque (from Mr.Singri Nanjappas house to Mr. Pallaghatti Adviappa's house). The Petitioner

and other devotees not being satisfied with the terms of the license, the utsava was not conducted in the years 1923 and 1924. The --- petitioners main contention is that the restriction newly laid down to take out licenses does not apply to processions with music of -- Muzrai Institutions and that Government order No.F.2303/Police 9-20 dated 16th September 1922 allowed the local Masjid no greater ----- privileges than what all places of worship were entitled to under the general law of the land."

3. In the then existing state of things how it was inexpedient to concede the petitioners request is explained in the Deputy Commissioner's letters dated 14th June 1923 and 29th January 1925. In the circumstances of the case the need for the grant of a ----- license is obvious, and it is the duty of the aggrieved party to go up in a formal manner to the higher Court, Government, or the Chief Court, as the case may be and obtain a final decision and it does not seem necessary to go to a decision on the telegram. Mr. T.G. Krishna Setty will, if approved, be given a suitable endorsement in confirmity with the above.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Muzrai Commissioner.

KSR.

Letter No.H.C.854/22-23 dated the 29th January 1925 from the Deputy Commissioner Tumkur District to the Muzrai Commissioner in ---- Mysore.

"Averting to your letter No.C.1494/23-24 dated 25th December 1923 enquiring whether the other temple in connection with which Basaveswara procession and Sivabhajana were conducted in the Tiptur town is a Muzrai Institution and whether the conduct of the procession is supported by mamool etc., I have the honor to state that the detailed enquiry and the examination of the Municipal Vice-President and the Lingayet Archak of the temple before the Amildar, disclose that the temple in question is not a Muzrai Institution and the conduct of procession is not supported by any mamool.

2. The vice-President of the Tiptur Town Municipality, Mr. Nanjundiah who has been the Patel for over 20 years, states that the procession in question, which took place in October 1922, was the first of its kind and that it did not pass through all the streets of Tiptur. A sketch showing the streets in which the procession passed is enclosed for ---- favour of perusal.

3. In this connection, I wish to bring to your notice that it is learnt that this procession, which was the unhappy cause forthe disturbance of the Public Tranquility andother undesirable consequences in the Tiptur town, was organised by some of the leading Lingayet Sahukars of Tiptur town for the first time in October 1922, as a sort of a test case after the passing of theorder by Government, in the Miscellaneous case No.P.2303/Police.9-20 dated 16th September 1922 (Mr. Dastagir Sab Vs. Mr. Krishna Rao) and as you are aware it resulted in a serious rioting ---- brought about by feeling of enmity and ill-will between the Mahomedan and Hindu residents of Tiptur.

4. Just about 3 months after the above incident, these Lingayets - headed by one Basavalingappa of Tiptur town applied on the 9th February 1923 to the Taluk Magistrate for a license to take Basaveswara Procession on the 13th and 14th February 1923 in the Tiptur town, in connection with the Sivaratri festival. But, when it was pointed out that this was too short a notice for obtaining a police report, the applicant Basava-lingappa changed the dates to 19th and 20th idem and a license was accordingly granted subject to the condition that the procession should not be taken with music in f

music in front of the Mosque, which after all was not more than a hundred feet, as all the local officers had come to the unanimous conclusion that under the then prevailing circumstances, and in view of what took place on the previous occasion as also in the interest of public peace, it was highly expedient to place this restriction. For, in addition to the rioting case, which has since ended in ---- coviction, there were about twenty private complaints filed by the Hindus and Mohamedans, against one another, arising out of the same circumstances connected with the procession of October 1922.

5. These people not being satisfied with the above order of the Taluk Magistrate preferred an appeal before the District Magistrate, which was finally disposed of on the 13th July 1923.

At the time of hearing the appeal, it was brought to notice that the appellant not only changed the dates readily without consulting his collegues, the other Dharmakartas, when he was told that there was not sufficient time to get the police report (to about a week later than the Sivaratri feast), but also appeared to be luke-warm about the carrying out of the procession itself as the local authorities did not permit him to take the procession before the Musjid in the interests of Public peace. This certainly, is not the attitude of a person, who is actuated by feelings of devotion.

Further, as to the case in point, relying on the decision of the Chief court in Appeal No.211 of 1908-09, Chennappa and others Vs.Setti Huchappa and others which while affirming the right of ~~xxx~~ every citizen to go in procession through the public street, also lays down the limitation within which that right can be exercised, and on the Government - order No.P.78-87/Pol.155-28-8 dated 5th July 1922, directing that such right can be temporarily suspended in order to prevent a breach of the public peace, the appeal was dismissed, and no action seems to have been taken by the appellants against this order.

6. In view of the above circumstances, I believe that the procession of the Basaveswara Devaru, which was conducted for the first time only -- in 1922 was set up by some of the members of the Lingayat Community in their zeal to exercise their privilege.

The

The vernacular file connected with the enquiry conducted by the Amildar is enclosed."

"C o p y"

For Muzra Commissioner. 5/2/20

App.F.VI G1.]

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Section

File No.

Serial No.

Diary No. of letter replied to

No. 1497
one file

To The ...

Ge .eral and Revenue Secretariat
( )
the *192*

Sir,

Date of issue ... 16.4.25

Signed by .. Ms T.R .....

Adverting to ... etc ...
No. C 738 dt ... 1925
reporting with reference to
the proceedings ... of
Inspector ... to
a Muzrai institution in Telia
That though the petitioner
Krishna Setty and others
contend that the restriction
newly laid down to take
out licence does not
apply to processions ...
Muzrai ... in ...

List of enclosures ... .

Copied by ... .

Examined by ... .

over

yet in view of the strained relationship between the local Mahomedans and the Hindus, the need for the grant of a license is obvious, and stating ~~proposing~~ that it is the duty of the aggrieved party to go in a formal manner to the higher court - ~~for~~ or the chief court as the case may be, and obtain a final decision, and adding that a suitable endorsement will be given if so approved of, I am directed to ~~state that I agree with you~~ in the views ~~above~~ ~~stated~~. ~~Let him~~ expend in any better understanding

(2) The ends are returned.

I have etc

8 4 25

(W) M Keatinge

Secy

6-4-25